

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 7, 11 and 12 being written in independent form. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner allowed Claim 12, and objected to Claims 4-5 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would allow Claims 4-5 if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Please amend Claims 1 and 7 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner alleged that the Priority claim requirements have not been met. The Examiner objected to the Drawings, as well as the Specification. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,904,025 to *Madour et al.* (hereinafter *Madour*) in view of the *Gustafsson et al.*, "Mobile IP Regional Registration" published on July 13, 2000 (hereinafter *Gustafsson*). The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Madour* in view of *Gustafsson* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,134 to *LaPorta et al.* (hereinafter *LaPorta*).

Regarding the Priority issue, the Examiner alleged that the certified copy of the foreign priority documents for Korean Application Serial No. 200-69309 and the translation of the certified copy have not been received as allegedly required by 35 U.S.C. §119(b). It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

First, the certified copy was submitted to the Patent Office on January 2, 2002, as indicated by the "Applicant Response to Pre-Exam Formalities Notice" dated January 18,

2002, which is viewable on PAIR. Moreover, the certified copy was received by the Patent Office on January 18, 2002 as indicated by the date stamp on the returned postcard that we have in our file. A copy of this postcard is attached hereto, along with a copy of the cover page of the certified copy.

Second, pursuant to M.P.E.P. §201.14(b) under the heading “Right of Priority, Papers Required”, it is clearly stated that the papers required are the claim for priority and the certified copy of the foreign application, which Applicant has provided as previously discussed. There is no requirement of a translation of the certified copy of the translation, as alleged by the Examiner.

At least in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s objection to Priority herein is incorrect, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner grant the right of Priority in this application.

Regarding the Drawings objection, the Examiner alleged that FIGs. 1-4 should be designated as “Prior Art.” In response, Applicant has enclosed herewith these figures labeled as “Prior Art”, and respectfully requests that this objection be therefore withdrawn.

Regarding the Specification objection, the Examiner alleged that no antecedent basis is provided for “re-registration” in Claims 1 and 7. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner is incorrect. The recitation “re-registration” is preceded by the recitation “a”, which is a proper article to use when such a term is initially recited in a claim. In fact, there is only one recitation of “re-register” in each of Claims 1 and 7. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that M.P.E.P. §2173.05(e) under the heading “Lack of Antecedent Basis”, states that a claim is indefinite when it contains words or phrases whose meaning is unclear. Applicant respectfully asserts to the Examiner that there is nothing unclear by the word “re-registration.” It simply means to register again,

and only one recitation of this word appears in each of these claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn, and withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11, the Examiner alleged that *Madour* teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1, except for upon receiving an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, said Agent Advertisement message being transmitted by the first GGSN, and transmitting by the second GGSN a location information message to the home agent. The Examiner cited *Gustafsson* to cure these deficiencies. Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner is incorrect.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, transmitting by the first GGSN an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the second GGSN supports a foreign agent function, receiving the message by a mobile node. It is respectfully asserted that this recitation, as amended, is not taught in *Madour*, and that this shortcoming in *Madour* is not cured by *Gustafsson*.

Particularly, and in a further attempt to satisfy the Examiner's request for further specific distinctions and patentable novelty rendering the rejected claims patentable over the cited art, it is respectfully asserted that contrary to the rejection, *Madour* fails to disclose that the new GGSN serves as a foreign agent (FA) as taught herein, such that data doesn't have to be transmitted via a separate GFA.

To wit, as previously indicated, information indicating that the second GGSN supports a foreign agent function is transmitted by a first GGSN, and is received by a mobile node in Claim 1. However, it is respectfully asserted that no such information is transmitted by the old GGSN to a mobile node in *Madour*. The reference fails to teach

the message including information indicating that the new GGSN supports a FA function, as set forth in Claim 1, and this shortcoming in *Madour* is not cured by *Gustafsson*.

Regarding Claim 7, neither of the cited references appears to teach transmitting a second registration request message for requesting the location registration for the mobile node from the second GGSN to the first GGSN, if the first GGSN serves as the gateway foreign agent, and transmitting a location information message indicating location information of the mobile node from the first GGSN to the home agent, upon receiving the second registration request message, as recited *inter alia* in Claim 7. The Examiner concedes that these recitations are absent in *Madour* and relies on *Gustafsson* to cure the same. However, *Gustafsson* merely teaches using FAs or GFAs, which is in sharp contrast to the recitation at issue in Claim 7.

Moreover, since *Gustafsson* merely teaches using FAs and GFAs, as such, it is respectfully asserted that there would be no reason to request the location registration for the mobile node from the second GGSN to the first GGSN, if the first GGSN serves as the gateway foreign agent, as recited in Claim 7. Likewise, there would be no reason to transmit a location information message indicating location information of the mobile node from the first GGSN to the home agent, as further recited in Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 11, recited *inter alia* is transmitting by the first GGSN an Agent Advertisement message with an address of the second GGSN and information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function. A mobile node in Claim 11 moves from a current region of the second GGSN to a new region of the first GGSN. The Agent Advertisement message is received by the mobile node. Similar to the foregoing argument directed to the rejection of Claim 1, it is respectfully asserted that *Madour* fails to disclose that the new GGSN serves as a foreign agent (FA) as taught herein, such that data doesn't have to be transmitted via a separate GFA.

To wit, the mobile node in *Madour* fails to receive a message, transmitted by a first GGSN (in a new region to which the mobile node moves), the message including information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function, as directed to in Claim 11. It is respectfully asserted that no such information is transmitted to a mobile node in *Madour*. Similar to the foregoing as to Claim 1, the reference fails to teach the message including information indicating that the new GGSN supports a FA function, as set forth in Claim 11, and this shortcoming in *Madour* is not cured by *Gustafsson*.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that *Madour* in view of *Gustafsson*, fails to teach or fairly suggest each and every limitation of Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11, and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as to Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11 should thus be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

For at least the same reasons regarding the rejection of Claim 7, and further since *LaPorta* fails to cure the stated deficiencies in *Madour* and *Gustafsson*, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 10 should also be withdrawn, as Claim 10 depends on Claim 7. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 11-12 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-6 and 8-10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-12, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written in a cursive style.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/RCC/dr